



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,586	12/12/2000	Tyler Peppel	OOMP0001C	7217
22862	7590	11/24/2003	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2132	10	
DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/735,586	PEPPEL, TYLER
	Examiner Benjamin E Lanier	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12 and 25-32 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12, 25-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment of claims 9, 33, 34, 37, and 10, 13-24, and 33-37 has been fully considered and is entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see Amendment B, filed 11 September 2003, with respect to claims 9, 33, 34, and 37 rejected under Durst have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections under Durst have been withdrawn.
3. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Smith reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. MPEP 715.07(a) states:

Where conception occurs prior to the date of the reference, but reduction to practice is afterward, it is not enough merely to allege that applicant or patent owner had been diligent. *Ex parte Hunter*, 1889 C.D. 218, 49 O.G. 733 (Comm'r Pat. 1889). Rather, applicant must show evidence of facts establishing diligence.

In determining the sufficiency of a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, diligence need not be considered unless conception of the invention prior to the effective date is clearly established, since diligence comes into question only after prior conception is established. *Ex parte Kantor*, 177 USPQ 455 (Bd. App. 1958).

What is meant by diligence is brought out in *Christie v. Seybold*, 1893 C.D. 515, 64 O.G. 1650 (6th Cir. 1893). In patent law, an inventor is either diligent at a given time or

he is not diligent; there are no degrees of diligence. An applicant may be diligent within the meaning of the patent law when he or she is doing nothing, if his or her lack of activity is excused. Note, however, that the record must set forth an explanation or excuse for the inactivity; the USPTO or courts will not speculate on possible explanations for delay or inactivity. See *In re Nelson*, 420 F.2d 1079, 164 USPQ 458 (CCPA 1970). Diligence must be judged on the basis of the particular facts in each case. See MPEP § 2138.06 for a detailed discussion of the diligence requirement for proving prior invention. Under 37 CFR 1.131, the critical period in which diligence must be shown begins just prior to the effective date of the reference or activity and ends with the date of a reduction to practice, either actual or constructive (i.e., filing a United States patent application). Note, therefore, that only diligence before reduction to practice is a material consideration. The “lapse of time between the completion or reduction to practice of an invention and the filing of an application thereon” is not relevant to an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. See *Ex parte Merz*, 75 USPQ 296 (Bd. App. 1947). Form paragraph 7.62 (reproduced in MPEP § 715) may be used to respond to a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit where diligence is lacking.

4. Applicant’s evidence does not show a reduction to practice of the content scarcity and content authentication portions of the claimed invention. Applicant’s evidence shows the notion of searching for a rare card and states that this is support for content scarcity. Further applicant’s evidence shows finding a missing card at a local trade card store and states that this is support for content authentication. Card scarcity can be generated by user skill, timing, copy protection,

limited manufacturing, and random distribution of partial sets (specification, pages 11-12, 15).

Card authentication can be accomplished with encryption (specification, page 12, lines 12-13).

The evidence submitted does not discuss these concepts of card scarcity and card authenticity.

Further applicant's submission of the Declaration of Counsel and the tapped correspondence with counsel has failed to establish diligence in reduction to practice because nowhere in the above mentioned submissions is card scarcity and card authentication discussed or disclosed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after December 12, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1-7, 9, 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,533,124. Referring to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 25-32, Smith discloses executable program code under the control of a processor/controller (computer code segment embodied in

tangible medium) (Col. 5, lines 31-33), digital data (digital content) (Col. 5, line 51), software that causes trading card data that has been stored to be cleared or deleted (supports content scarcity and content authenticity) (Col. 3, lines 24-34), a copy protection scheme using encryption (lock and key mechanism) (Col. 2, lines 31-44), data for producing graphics, written text, sound, and video (graphic identification code and multimedia) (Col. 2, lines 13-17), interactive areas used to provide different graphics and multimedia (Col. 3, lines 13-15), and a PC (Col. 5, line 12), trading card software (Col. 5, line 27), input devices (Col. 5, line 27), and a display (Col. 5, line 30).

Referring to claim 3, Smith discloses a system comprising RAM (Col. 2, line 52), hard disk (Col. 9, line 5), or other disk drive (Col. 8, line 64).

Referring to claim 4, Smith discloses a copy protection scheme where the trading card data will be deleted after quitting the program (Col. 9, lines 19-22).

Referring to claim 7, Smith discloses individual data that is associated with a certain player or character that can be packaged together (Col. 2, lines 10-13).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,533,124, in view of Cooper, U.S. Patent No. 5,757,907. Referring to claim 8, Smith

discloses executable program code under the control of a processor/controller (computer code segment embodied in tangible medium) (Col. 5, lines 31-33), digital data (digital content) (Col. 5, line 51), software that causes trading card data that has been stored to be cleared or deleted (supports content scarcity and content authenticity) (Col. 3, lines 24-34), a copy protection scheme using encryption (lock and key mechanism) (Col. 2, lines 31-44), data for producing graphics, written text, sound, and video (graphic identification code and multimedia) (Col. 2, lines 13-17), interactive areas used to provide different graphics and multimedia (Col. 3, lines 13-15), and a PC (Col. 5, line 12), trading card software (Col. 5, line 27), input devices (Col. 5, line 27), and a display (Col. 5, line 30). Shamir discloses using watermark for protecting visual information (Col. 1, line 45 – Col. 2, line 15). Smith does not disclose executable program code that has a trial mode or trial number of sessions. Cooper discloses program code that has a trial mode defined by either a timer, or a counter (Col. 8, lines 38-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a time trial on the executable program code of Smith in order to reduce unnecessary risks of piracy or unauthorized utilization beyond the trial interval as taught in Cooper (Col. 2, lines 26-31).

9. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,533,124, in view of Welsh, U.S. Patent No. 4,970,666. Smith discloses executable program code under the control of a processor/controller (computer code segment embodied in tangible medium) (Col. 5, lines 31-33), digital data (digital content) (Col. 5, line 51), software that causes trading card data that has been stored to be cleared or deleted (supports content scarcity and content authenticity) (Col. 3, lines 24-34), a copy protection scheme using encryption (lock and key mechanism) (Col. 2, lines 31-44), data for producing graphics, written

Art Unit: 2132

text, sound, and video (graphic identification code and multimedia) (Col. 2, lines 13-17), interactive areas used to provide different graphics and multimedia (Col. 3, lines 13-15), and a PC (Col. 5, line 12), trading card software (Col. 5, line 27), input devices (Col. 5, line 27), and a display (Col. 5, line 30). Shamir discloses using watermark for protecting visual information (Col. 1, line 45 – Col. 2, line 15). Smith does not disclose a digital content library or album of computer code. Welsh discloses an image library containing a collection of images (Col. 3, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the image library in the executable code system of Smith because the library would enable the user to select additional image elements from the image library as taught in Welsh (Col. 3, lines 6-19).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 703-305-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 0 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703)305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

  
Benjamin E. Lanier

  
GILBERTO BARRON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100